



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/533,677

04/29/2005

Marco De Luca

007511.00022

8657

22907 7590 06/15/2009

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

1100 13th STREET, N.W.

SUITE 1200

WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER

PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2454

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/15/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/533,677	Applicant(s) DE LUCA ET AL.	
	Examiner JEONG S. PARK	Art Unit 2454	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 February 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/533,677 filed on 4/29/2005. The amendment presented on 2/27/2009, which cancels claims 17 and 21, amends claims 1-16, 18-20 and 22, and adds claim 23, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 have been examined.

Claim Objections

2. The amendment presented on 2/27/2009 providing change to the claims is noted. All prior objections to the claims are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. The amendment presented on 2/27/2009 cancelling claim 21 and amends claim 22 obviates the outstanding 35 USC 101 rejections, and they are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the apparatus" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2454

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-11 and 18-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegel et al. (hereinafter Siegel)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143961 A1) in view of Alonso et al. (hereinafter Alonso)(U.S. Patent No. 6,434,700 B1), and further in view of Cosic (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065662).

Regarding claim 1, Siegel teaches as follows:

a device (PMT server 10 in figure 1 and 2) configured to control access to databases (database 14 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0027]) storing personal profiles (PMT protocol controls access to each piece of data within a user profile, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0021]) by a plurality of remote entities (user 56, service provider 54 in figure 2) within a telecommunication network (network 50 in figure 2, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0027]) supporting a plurality of services, the device comprising:

a first plurality of databases (multiple databases, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0028]) and interfaces (UI logic 28, PMT protocol 12 and PMT server 10 in figure 1) for managing and centrally controlling access, from any of said remote entities to said first plurality of databases and to a second plurality of databases (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0024]), said interfaces comprising:

a plurality of application interfaces (UI logic 28 in figure 1) configured to allow access to the first and second plurality of databases by said plurality of remote entities (web devices 32 and WAP devices 30 in figure 1) and configured to manage different

Art Unit: 2454

mechanisms for accessing databases (UI logic facilitates interactions between the deferent type of users with the PMT server, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026]),

an authentication unit (authentication mechanism 19 in figure 2) configured to identify said remote entities (see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0027]), and

an authorization unit configured to authorize said remote entities to use said adapters, by verifying essential requirements and the management of a corresponding authorization to use (getPermission operation, see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0050]).

Siegel does not teach the account unit for tracking the accesses to databases.

Alonso teaches as follows:

a method and apparatus for allowing users to use computer networks with other authentication and authorization mechanism (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 46-57);

an Access Control Server (ACS) provides a central point of control for the management of multiple security services and network devices and provides Authorization, Authentication and Accounting (AAA server is well-known for one of ordinary skill in the art) functions for a managed network (see, e.g., col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 5); and

the user profile information includes authentication information and accounting information related to what the user has done or is doing can be stored in the relational database for billing and security auditing (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 22-29).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Siegel to include the accounting information by utilizing the well-

Art Unit: 2454

known AAA functions as taught by Alonso in order to efficiently calculate the billing information based on the access information.

Siegel in view of Alonso do not teach of a plurality of adapters configured to allow access to the first and second plurality of databases, each adapter configured to manage a corresponding database typology.

Cosic teaches as follows:

a universal data management interface (UDMI) system includes a processing system that executes instructions to generate a visual interface through which a user can access, manage, and manipulate data on plural different types of remote databases (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0012]);

a UDMI that includes a processing system that executes instructions to connect to multiple standard database management systems and to allow multiple users to access, manage, and manipulate data within each of the multiple standard database management systems (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014]); and

the multiple standard database management systems includes one or more of Oracle, MSSQL Server, SyBase, Informix, DB2, dBase, mSQL, MySQL and any other standard database management system (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Cosic with Siegel in view of Alonso to include a universal data management interface (UDMI) in order to efficiently interface different type of databases.

Regarding claim 2, Siegel in view of Alonso and Cosic teach all the limitation of claim as presented above per claim 1.

Alonso further teaches as follows:

the ACS communicates with a relational database to simplify the storage of user profile information against which users are authenticated and the user profile information includes authentication information and accounting information related to what the user has done or is doing can be stored in the relational database for billing and security auditing (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 22-29).

Therefore, Alonso inherently teaches storing all user activity including access times and data exchanged during access.

Regarding claim 3, Siegel teaches as follows:

plurality of services comprises Voice over IP or multimedia or internet services (the service provider may be an Internet service provider (ISP) which customers access via the Internet (see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0029])).

Regarding claim 4, Cosic teaches as follows:

each of the plurality of adapters allows access to the plurality of first and second databases independently from a technology of the particular database (a UDMI that includes a processing system that executes instructions to connect to multiple standard database management systems and to allow multiple users to access, manage, and manipulate data within each of the multiple standard database management systems (see, e.g., page 1, paragraph [0014])). Therefore it is rejected for similar reason as presented above in claim 1.

Art Unit: 2454

Regarding claim 5, Siegel teaches as follows:

the access to the application interfaces (UI logic 28 in figure 1) corresponds to at least one of a plurality of authorization contained in an XML descriptor (the UI logic facilitates interactions between the web devices (32 in figure 1) with the PMT server, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026], wherein the web devices rely upon a web browser). Therefore, the UI logic supporting web browser inherently includes an XML descriptor.

Regarding claim 6, Siegel teaches as follows:

each of the interfaces allows the access to one of the plurality of first and second databases via one of a trusted application interfaces and an untrusted application interface, wherein the trusted application interface is used wherein access is requested by an authorized applications, and wherein the untrusted application interface is used when access is requested by an unknown applications (UI logic facilitates interactions between the deferent type of users with the PMT server, see, e.g., page 2, paragraph [0026]).

Regarding claims 7-10, Siegel teaches as follows:

each of the interfaces allows the access to one of the plurality of first and second databases in a read mode (equivalent to read access), a write mode (equivalent to write access) or a search mode (equivalent to availability access)(type of access, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0033]).

Regarding claim 11, Siegel teaches as follows:

each of the plurality of first databases contains user profile information (the user profile includes user name, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0031] and figure 4).

Regarding claims 18 and 22, Siegel in view of Alonso and Cosic teach all limitations of claim as presented above per claims 1 and 3.

Regarding claim 19, Siegel in view of Alonso and Cosic teach all limitations of claim as presented above per claim 1.

Regarding claim 20, Siegel in view of Alonso and Cosic teach all limitations of claim as presented above per claim 1.

Regarding claim 23, Siegel teaches as follows:

the second plurality of databases (multiple database can be interpreted as the applicant's second plurality of database, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0028]) is located separately from the device (database 14 in figure 2 is located separately from the server 10 in figure 2, see, e.g., figure 2).

8. Claims 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Siegel et al. (hereinafter Siegel)(U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0143961 A1) in view of Alonso et al. (hereinafter Alonso)(U.S. Patent No. 6,434,700 B1), Cosic (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0065662), and further in view of Cai et al. (hereinafter Cai)(U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0016880 A1).

Regarding claims 12-15, Siegel in view of Alonso and Cosic teach all limitations of claim except for the user profile comprising service profile and terminal profile.

Cai teaches as follows:

user profile comprises identity, personal data, preferences, subscribed services and used terminals (user profile in figure 3, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0050]);

databases contain information characterizing a service in terms of service profile (service profile in figure 3, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0052]);

service profile comprises information characterizing the configuration of services for different users (see, e.g., page 4, paragraph [0062] and figure 8); and

databases contain information characterizing the terminals used in said multimedia and/or telecommunication service network (device profile in figure 3, see, e.g., page 3, paragraph [0051]).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Siegel in view of Alonso to include a profile manager comprising a user profile, service profile and device profile as taught by Cai in order to efficiently provide proper service based on user and device profiles.

Regarding claim 16, Siegel teaches UI logic (28 in figure 1) supporting wireless users (36 in figure 1) equipped with WAP devices (30 in figure 1). Therefore Cai's device profile inherently includes applicant's static characteristic and dynamic characteristic of the WAP devices, wherein the static characteristic can be interpreted as a device ID and the dynamic characteristic can be interpreted as a current location as well-known for one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 17, Siegel in view of Alonso, Cosic and Cai teach all limitations of claim as presented above per claims 1 and 16.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 2/27/2009, with respect to claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEONG S. PARK whose telephone number is (571)270-1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 7:00 - 3:30 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2454

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. S. P./
Examiner, Art Unit 2454

June 11, 2009

***/Nathan J. Flynn/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2454***